

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 11, 2003. Claims 2, 3, 5 to 7, 11 to 15 and 19 to 29 are pending in the application. Claims 2, 3, 5-7, 11 to 19 and 25 to 29 are allowed. Claims 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 15, 19 to 22 and 24 are objected to for informalities. Applicants thank the Examiner for his indication of allowable subject matter.

The informalities of Claim 15 have been attended to by amendment as recited above. Applicants submit that Claim 15 is now in condition for allowance and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 19 to 22 were objected to as being dependent on an objected claim, namely, Claim 15. As Claim 15 is now in condition for allowance, Applicants submit that Claims 19 to 22 are also in condition for allowance and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 has been amended to correspond with currently amended Claim 15. Applicants submit that Claim 7 is in condition for allowance and respectfully request same.

Claims 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Currently amended Claims 23 and 24 have been amended to define which pixels are being used in the pulse-width control step. Specifically, Claims 23 and 24 call for using an image pixel to which an image pixel adjacent in sub-scanning direction exists and is exposed in a different main scanning direction is shorter than a pulse width to which another image pixel adjacent in a sub-scanning direction and exposed in a different main scanning

doesn't exist in the pulse-width control step. Withdrawal of the § 112 rejection objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 23 and 24 have also been amended to delete their respective "detecting" steps. This action was taken in keeping with the Office Action dated July 15, 2003, which entered objections and rejections based on now-deleted recitations of "detecting means" in claims like original Claim 7. As already stated, Applicants do not concede the correctness of these objections and rejections; nevertheless, no good reason is seen in maintaining these recitations in Claims 23 and 24, since it is clear that allowance of Claims 23 and 24 was not premised on the deleted language.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael K. Dufil

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 32622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200